

1960

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP75-  
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

I have constantly maintained that there is no such thing as a perfect inspection system. What we need are reasonable safeguards, safeguards which will disclose any serious cheating. In international affairs, just as in domestic society, inspection is a substitute for trust.

Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau in a letter to the Washington Post, February 23, 1960, says the new Russian concession at Geneva may be a radical change from their former stand, motivated by a new recognition of the horror of nuclear weapons and their desire to survive. I ask unanimous consent that the remarkable letter of this distinguished student of world politics be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Soviet Union has just made another concession in the Geneva negotiations on the cessation of atomic tests. It has declared its willingness to allow international inspection of a limited number of underground disturbances whose nature cannot be identified with the presently available seismographic equipment.

This concession follows a number of others concerning international inspection and control on Russian territory, which together constitute a radical departure from past Soviet attitudes. Speculation is of course rife about the reasons why the Russians are taking this unprecedented attitude, which has been explained primarily in terms of propagandistic and military tactics.

I have been myself consistently suspicious of Soviet intentions and have raised my eyes against the spirit of Geneva of 1955 and the spirit of Camp David of 1959 as soon as they transpired. I have but recently in a series of articles advanced the proposition that Khrushchev is more dangerous an antagonist and more difficult to negotiate with than was Stalin. But I have always credited the leaders of the Soviet Union with a sense of reality.

A realistic evaluation of the world scene has convinced me since 1955 that if the nuclear armaments race cannot be brought under control before any number of nations will have nuclear weapons, only a miracle will save mankind. The controlled cessation of atomic tests is a first small step in the direction of the control of the atomic armaments race itself.

If the United States and the Soviet Union cannot agree on this, they will not be able to agree on anything else in this field. We are standing therefore at a turning point in the history of the world. If we fall here we have in all likelihood sealed our and mankind's doom, and the only issue remaining to be settled will be how and when we shall be doomed.

Is it farfetched to assume that the Russian leaders are aware of what most knowledgeable observers outside the Soviet Union know, and that they have radically changed their position with regard to international control and inspection on their territory because they want to survive?

This explanation, I admit, is simple and lacks in that elaborate and improbable sophistication with which some Soviet experts like to make things complicated and hence, unmanageable. But it may well be worthy of some consideration by that unfortunate interdepartmental committee which, for lack of guidance from above, must hammer out as best it can our policy on this momentous issue.

HANS J. MORGENTHAU.

WASHINGTON.

### Sudden Awakening?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a column written by Jerry Gabriel in a recent issue of the New Era, Reading, Pa.

*Sudden Awakening?*  
(By Jerry Gabriel)

The Saturday Evening Post (Feb. 5, 1960) with its usual aplomb and dignity (?) editorializes this week on the following: "Why Must Business Leaders in Politics Be so Neutral?" I don't always read the Post editorial, but this heading intrigued me. First, the thought crossed my mind that somebody must be kidding. Since when have business leaders in politics been neutral? I decided to absorb this revelation.

The writer, Charles W. White, points out that he "is one who has been active in typical big-city campaigns in Indiana," which qualifies him (I suppose) as somewhat of an oracle in these matters. At least the Post must think so.

Anyway, he begins by alluding to last year as being one in which the businessman in politics movement fell flat on its face even though it had a most exuberant start. Then he states that the Republican Party "took a shattering in Indiana as it did in most States."

Now this is significant to me because in his second paragraph he has already contradicted the heading on the editorial. Does he mean that business leaders are "neutral" Republicans? I guess so.

Then he gets to the core of the issue. He quotes a publicity release from a "corporate spokesman" (now) which says in effect that folks should not get the impression that businessmen are out to slobber labor at the polls—all they want is for all groups to be fairly represented. Mr. White then proceeds to point out what he calls the truth, "corporate enterprise does have a legitimate ax to grind concerning labor political domination." Then he proceeds to spank Coopers for fighting corporations, for endorsing Democratic candidates, for contributing to their campaign funds and for supplying cars and workers at the polls.

Then he says, "if business fellows were frank about what they stand for and why, they could persuade many workmen and women to come along." In other words it ain't nice for us to do it but it is OK if they do it. Holy smother, I'm crying.

The balance of Mr. White's opus is devoted to eulogizing the political action efforts of General Electric, Republic Steel, Gulf Oil, and the Ford Motor Co.

Here is the "paralytic" statement. After pointing out the merits of the above mentioned firms in their approach, brother White says, "[this] is a far more sensible approach than stirring up junior executives about politics and patriotism, and they failing to suggest which side their bread is buttered on." In other words, be neutral as heck, but buddy, if you like your job in this world you better pull the right lever at the voting place.

Now, friends, with this pitch in mind, I ask you, if all these "businessmen" were put in a paper bag, shook up, then turned upside down, how many "politically neutral" fellows do you think would drop out of the bag? Right. You're absolutely right, and don't forget it when election time rolls around.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 26, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column by Samuel B. Gach, publisher of the California Jewish Voice, entitled "National Brainwash," dealing with the issue of our Nation's defenses, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(From the California Jewish Voice,

Feb. 12, 1960)

National Brainwash  
(By Samuel B. Gach)

Fantastic is as close an adjective with which in this historical case, I can come up with to describe America's present dilemma. Admittedly, the Madison Avenue soap hucksters did a bangup job in 1953, when the domestic tories commissioned the gray flannel boys to create consumer's acceptance for the product Eisenhower.

So good a job was it that the quid boys refined the minds of stupid, naive America to the extent that when the name Eisenhower was read or heard, a father image was instantaneously conjured up, with the conviction tagged on that Ike was the omnipotent who knew all and could do no wrong.

This writer most certainly heard the hucksters no grudge, because all they did was, in the simplest sense, a job for which an advertising agency is in business . . . to create a desire in the minds of the public to buy the client's product. The question of strategy, value, idealism has no place in the planning of a national selling campaign when a product is being discussed in the inner sanctum of an ad agency. To what extent they can be excused.

It is an entirely different matter, however, when year after year we are treated to the outrageous spectacle of the degeneracy of most of the national daily press and the slick stock weekly magazines. Not only have they perpetuated the Madison Avenue hoax about the father image, and thrown objectivity into the wastebasket, but they went one step further: In covering for Ike these past 8 years they led the public to believe that with the advent of Eisenhower the infallible, we actually have been privileged to witness the "second coming."

Lack of space prohibits taking apart item by item the mendacious apologies with which the above mentioned purveyors of news and comment hid from public view the fact that Eisenhower was not only a very ordinary man, not overly endowed with brilliance, but rather an easy going, vacation loving, non-reading, ill-informed, and very mediocre Chief Executive.

We shall therefore discuss the most serious of the series of journalistic crimes—their brass check handling of our defense bind, and their attempts to focus blame on politics for our sorry position as second class world power, rather than truthfully place the blame on the man who should have known better, but let us slide for 8 long years.

General Taylor, General Medaris, and a host of other Army, rocket and missile experts, have testified that we are at present in a seriously vulnerable position; that the Soviet is far ahead of us, and that there is little chance for us ever to catch up.